



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,609	12/12/2001		Solomon H. Snyder	01107.00171	6957
22907	7590	07/22/2004		EXAMINER	
BANNER &	WITCO	OFF	SLOBODYANSKY, ELIZABETH		
1001 G STREET N W SUITE 1100				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20001				1652	

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/889,609	SNYDER ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD	1652				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: ( condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applic (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in				
1988	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	!				
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The department of the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the ed statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	t's Brief must be filed within the p FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	period set forth in of the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:					
<ul><li>(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li></ul>						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s): See Continuation Shee	<u>t</u> .				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woul canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request f application in condition for allowance because: §		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims to	nt(s) a)□ will not be entered or t would be rejected is provided bel	o)⊠ will be entered and an low or appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	S:					
Claim(s) allowed: 39-66.						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 67-70,73-86 and 89-97.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·				
10. Other:	A	3. Slobodyaren				
		Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1652				

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112, 1st of claims 67-97; 112, 2nd of claims 52, 59; objection of claims 39, 47-50, 58-66.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Remarks refer to the outstanding rejections that are overcome. However, the newly amended claims 67 and 86 would require 112, 2nd rejection. The claims are confusing because it is unclear what limitation is implied by the reference to "substitutions which do not abolish serine racemase activity" since claims 67 and 86 are drawn to active serine racemase and a DNA encoding thereof, respectively. Further, the reference to the Smith-Waterman algorithm is redundant because % identity is the same with any method of calculation thereof.